

Application No. 10/628,221  
Amendment Dated 12/14/2004  
Reply to Office Action of 9/14/2004

### Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-4 and 6-10 are presently pending. Claim 5 is canceled. Claims 1, 2 and 6 are amended.

The Applicant thanks Examiner for recognition of the patentability of claim 5 if claim 5 was rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicant has incorporated all of the limitations of claim 5 into independent claim 1. For the foregoing reason, claim 1 is now patentable. Claims 2-4 and 6-10 depend upon claim 1 and are patentable for at least similar reasons to claim 1.

Claims 2 and 6 were amended to add "further" to be consistent with the amendment to claim 1 for clarity and not to overcome any cited prior art.

Claims 1-4 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ovshinsky et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,627,148) in view of Stetson (U.S. Pat. No. 6,425,251). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the above reasons.

Ovshinsky discloses a particulate hydrogen storage material that is hydrided in a stainless steel tank. (Col. 14, lines 12-47.) Stetson merely disclosed that the flow channel material 4 is a "graphite foam sheet." (Col. 12, lines 13-14.), as opposed to other structures of the carbon foam recited in the claims. Carbon foam may have a graphitic foam content. For example, after the foam is carbonized, the carbon foam may be graphitized to some extent by application of heat over a certain time period. The combination of Ovshinsky and Stetson does not meet amended claim 1, which recites the "thermally conductive liner comprising a carbon foam coating."

Claims 6 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ovshinsky and Stetson as applied to claims 1-4 and 7-9 above, and further in view of Ramachandran et al. (U.S. 2004/0035401A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ramachandran allegedly discloses "hydride storage units 51 are inserted through a plurality of heat conductive fins 53" in FIG. 4. (Paragraph 46.) However, Ramachandran is a confusing and defective reference because in FIG. 4 no conductive fins are actually shown. Rather, reference number 53, which is supposed to indicate fins, actually indicates a solid member with a series of holes or bores for receiving cylindrical metal hydride storage units 51. Accordingly, the combination of

Application No. 10/628,221  
Amendment Dated 12/14/2004  
Reply to Office Action of 9/14/2004

Ramachandran, Ovshinsky and Stetson does not meet claim 6 or claim 10 because Ramachandran does not show fins in any of its drawings and because claim 6 and 10 incorporate all limitations of amended claim 1. Claim 1 now recites the "thermally conductive liner comprising a carbon foam coating."

For the foregoing reasons, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance, including claims 1-4 and 6-10 and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Any fees or charges due as a result of filing of the present paper may be charged against Deposit Account 04-0525. Two duplicates of this page are enclosed.


Respectfully,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Darin E. Bartholomew  
Reg. No. 36,444  
Patent Department  
Deere & Company  
One John Deere Place  
Moline, IL 61265  
Telephone No. (309) 765-5615

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1480  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
on: Dec. 14, 2004  
Date

Deere & Company  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature Date 12/14/04